



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

cheapness, he made inquiries. He soon found out all about the unsavory reputation of the house. Still he was all the more eager to buy it. The very day he moved in, when it began to grow dusk, he ordered his bed to be laid in the front room. Providing himself with lights, pen and paper, he began writing so as to keep his mind off the ghost. At first there was no noise except the scratching of the pen. Then came the sound of clanking chains. He did not raise his eyes but kept on writing and, to stiffen his purpose, shut his ears. Then the noise freshened and grew nearer. Now it was all but on the threshold. Now it had cleared the doorway. He looked up and recognized the phantom. It stopped and beckoned to him with its finger. In reply he signified that it should wait a moment, and bent to his notebook. It then rattled the chains about his ears. Lifting his eyes, he beheld it nodding as before. Without delay he took up the lamp and followed. It dragged itself along as though hampered by fetters. After it had turned aside into the courtyard of the house, suddenly it slipped away and deserted its companion. Left alone he marked the spot by a pile of leaves and grass. In the morning he went to the police and advised them to have the place excavated. When they had done so, they found a skeleton. Chains had rusted into the very bones and held them in their iron grasp. The relics were collected and buried at public expense. When the shades of the old man had been duly laid to rest, the house ceased to be haunted.

You will perceive from my account that we Romans are tightly wrapped in the bonds of superstition, that the terror of offending some spirit by neglect ever dogs our steps, and that all real spirituality is throttled by our *quid pro quo* view of religion in which for favors received we contract to repay with the blood of rams and the fragrance of incense.

Given at Rome on the Kalends of February, A. U. C. DCXIII.

Portland, Oregon.

ARTHUR PATCH MCKINLAY.

A SOCIALIST AND THE CLASSICS

Mr. E. Pernerstorfer is Vice-President of the Lower House of the Austrian Parliament and the leader of the Socialist Party in that country. It certainly does not seem likely that the leader of so advanced a political party is a reactionary, or not appreciative of modern progress and achievement. Yet, Mr. Pernerstorfer is one of the most earnest and ardent defenders of the Classics as the foundation of all culture. In 1912 he contributed to the *Sozialistische Monatshefte* an article entitled *The Value of Classical Education*.

He begins by insisting that the Humanistic school, as far as men of the professions are concerned, can not be replaced by any other. Nobody knows his mother tongue who has not also learned one foreign

tongue. It must be conceded that this intimate understanding of one's native speech is strengthened by a thorough study of a modern language, but by no means to the same extent as through the study of the two ancient languages. For all modern languages are too closely affiliated grammatically, because they are closely affiliated in time. Many centuries, on the other hand, separate us from Latin and Greek, and these two differ from each other to a considerable degree. In language and in civilization, the Greeks and the Romans have for centuries exercised the deepest influence upon the civilization of Europe. . . . Nobody can deny the value of grammatical study, especially in connection with the Latin language. A youth of no more than twelve years here becomes acquainted with logical constructions of great refinement, long before he has even heard the word logic. This is the reason why the schools must never give up translation into Latin, for this exercise sharpens the intellect as no other subject, not even Mathematics, can do. Nor is it true, in general, that all instruction in grammar necessarily is dry and pedantic. Dry and pedantic any teaching in any subject may be. On the other hand, it is possible to make grammatical instruction fruitful and inspiring. But its greatest value lies in this, that it absolutely excludes 'faking'. This outweighs even all the practical advantages to be derived from the study of Latin, as its assistance in the study of the Romance languages, its indispensability for certain professions, etc.

Mr. Pernerstorfer then makes a still more ardent plea for the teaching of Greek. Latin, he says, without Greek is incomplete and one-sided; only from the study of both Greek and Latin do we learn to understand ancient life, the importance of which for human civilization is so great, so fundamental, that we should be beggared, were it possible to eliminate antiquity from human history. . . . The unique character of the Greek people, of its art and literature compels us to claim that the teaching of its language is absolutely imperative. Only once has there been on this earth a race destined to unite foreign influences with its own native genius to a new and harmonious unity and to ascend to the summits of thought and art. . . . There is in no two civilizations a more marked national contrast than that between the Romans and the Greeks. This contrast shows us the fact of nationality as an indispensable law, and thus guards against that false internationalism, which tries to decompose and melt into one another all nations, and is as far remote from the idealism of genuine cosmopolitanism as from the reality of the facts. Thus the study of antiquity furnishes the most valuable insight into practical life.

On another occasion, during an investigation into the defects of secondary education in Austria, Mr. Pernerstorfer attacked the tendency to sacrifice quality to quantity in education. It seems, he said, that

many well-meaning people believe it to be the business of the school to teach *omnia quae sciri possunt*. Knowledge, it is true, is the material with which the schools must work. Without it there could be no schools. But the duty of the school is far less to instill into the brain a certain quantity of knowledge than to teach the pupil how to learn, to beget in the child the joy of learning. It is claimed that grammatical instruction must give way to more practical studies. Now, we live in the age of applied science. We might even write a history of human civilization based upon the history of the development of technical instruments. And yet, there are those who speak with scorn of the study of language, which, after all, is the greatest tool which the human mind has made for its own use, and they believe they understand the use of this tool, if they are able to converse in a language. They heap ridicule upon the fact that those who learn Latin cannot speak it, while any clerk who wishes to go abroad 'masters' a foreign language in three months. But they forget that to speak a language is not a knowledge at all; it is an acquired ability, like tobogganing, swimming and such. The chief value of teaching Latin is to train the youth in clear-cut logical distinctions. Any translation into Latin compels the pupil to perform logical operations. If grammar has to go, Latin might go as well. For the mere reading of the literature, valuable as it is, does not justify the study of Latin, and, moreover, it has no value whatever without a knowledge of Greek.

Lastly, it is said that students never again open a Latin book. Even if that were true, it would prove nothing. There is a beautiful paradox, that culture is the sum total of what a man has forgotten. But behind the paradox is a great truth: one becomes cultured by training one's mind in such a way that on every occasion one is able to take notice not of the accidental but of causation and consequence. It is immaterial whether a rule is forgotten. The important thing is this, that the learning, and the practice of such a rule have graven certain grooves in our brains. Are not mathematical proofs as quickly forgotten as Greek aorists? . . . It is true that life is practical and that the first question is how to provide for one's sustenance. That is our contention, and we always state it, when people ridicule Socialism by saying, 'you socialists are interested only in the concrete, in what touches your stomach'. Hungry people, people who know not where to lay their heads, can not be idealists. But let them not forget that far above anything practical there is another world, the world of immaterial possessions, and that these are not the achievements of applied science,—these are only means to an end; far above these is art, and we still say with the poet, Who does not listen to the voice of poetry, is a barbarian, be he who he may.

ERNST RIESS.

CORRESPONDENCE

My attention has been called to an article on my letter to the Harvard Alumni Bulletin in October, signed by "G. L." (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.121). If Professor Lodge will read my letter over again, he will see that he has misunderstood its purpose. I did not write that letter in order to make a case for the "paramount importance" of archaeology, nor of the approach to classical studies through the medium of archaeology, but to defend archaeology against an ill-deserved attack. I would be the last person in the world to maintain that through the study of archaeology alone the Greek atmosphere is to be gained: on the contrary, I believe that, as I said in my letter, archaeology is a great, though not indispensable help to the proper appreciation of Greek life and thought. To the serious student of archaeology, an intimate and appreciative knowledge of the classical languages is indispensable; and the "Grecians" of whom G. L. so learnedly speaks are not serious archaeologists but dilettanti. In fact, they can be nothing else, without a thorough knowledge of Greek and Latin. In my opinion, the knowledge and appreciation of the beauty of Greek literature is the primary thing, but, if it can be attained, as I think it can, through the secondary help of archaeology, let us not slight it, but use it as a means to an end.

In justice to myself, and that my opinion may be no longer misrepresented, I shall esteem it as a favor if you will give this communication the same publicity that you gave G. L.'s article.

STEPHEN B. LUCE, JR.

[Perhaps Mr. Luce does not regard archaeology as of "paramount" importance. If he objects to that word I will gladly substitute another. As for the rest the quotations from Mr. Luce's own article seem to me sufficient to justify my conclusions. G. L.]

The views expressed in the editorial of February 15 seem to me to call for vigorous protest. In the first place, may I ask, is it *reasonable*—I will not say *politic*,—in this twentieth century, for any paper that is supposed to be upholding the best interests of the Classics, in any way to stimulate antagonism between classical literature and classical archaeology? May we not reasonably continue to regard the two as mutually helpful? As to which of the two is the more important, why spend time to debate? Two good friends cannot be forever considering in their hearts which is the bigger man. Else they are no friends.

And is it quite axiomatic, as you imply, that the study of ancient cisterns adds nothing to one's appreciation of the Greek genius? Does the lover of Aristophanes get nothing from the study of that complex of rock cuttings—cisterns, drains, steps, walls—in the bare hills beyond the Pnyx? For my part, I believe Greek stock rose on my private 'Change a good fifty percent the day I saw the sewerage system of the Palace at Cnossus. Nor has it ever declined since.

Again, need we so despise those who approach Greek by some other way than that which is orthodox? (*Orthodoxy*, of course, = ὀρθόδοξα ἡμῶν). For instance, I know a man who, at forty, has been "lured to the study of Greek by the interest which he has found in the remains of Greek art", and who as a result of that lure is now beginning to enjoy the Odyssey in the original. I know another, one of the most brilliant students I ever had, who was first